

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the Specification

In reference to the Examiner's comments regarding the substitute specification filed on January 31, 2003, Applicant submits that no new matter was added to the substitute specification.

2. In the Claims

In the List of Current Claims, it is readily evident that claims 30, 31, 32, 35, 36, 44, 47, 49 and 58 have been amended.

It is respectfully submitted that no new issues requiring further detailed consideration or search have been presented by the proposed amendments and that entry of the claim amendments is appropriate under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. Entry of the amendment at least for purposes of appeal is respectfully requested in view of the fact that they present rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal (37 C.F.R. 1.116).

Concerning claim 30, this claim has been amended by removing the last paragraph starting with "wherein the deformable protrusion..." and ending with "deposit surface." This amendment overcomes the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph by deleting the rejected language in its entirety.

Claim 31 has been amended by removing the language "having at least one of the following characteristics," the paragraph starting with "one side of the notches" and ending with "and/or buckled shape," and the last line of the claim. Moreover, changes have been made to this claim in view of the deleted language.

Claim 32 has been amended to be dependent from claim 31, and a substantial portion of this claim has been removed in view of its new dependency from claim 31.

Claim 36 has been amended by the removal of the term "and" in line 5.

Claims 35, 44, 47 and 49 have been amended to be dependent from claim 29, and portions of these claims have been removed in view of their dependency from claim 29. Moreover, claim 47 has been amended by the removal of the term "as" in the second to the last line of the claim. It will be pointed out that claim 29 presently stands allowed.

Claim 58 has been amended by the addition of the word "A" at the beginning of the claim.

New claim 59 is submitted which recites subject matter from claim 31 that has been removed therefrom in the present amendment. It is submitted that this new claim does not introduce any new issues that require further searching since it is presumed that the subject matter recited by this claim has already been searched.

In view of the new claims, withdrawal of the objections to claims 31, 34, 36, 39, 47 and 58 is respectfully requested in the next communication from the Examiner. In addition, removal of the rejection of claim 30 is kindly petitioned in view of the amendments to claim 30. Lastly, acceptance and examination of claim 59 is requested.

3. Rejection of Claim 31 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as Being Anticipated by U.S. Patent 2,861,659 (Hagerty et al.)

Claim 31 is presently rejected as being anticipated by the Hagerty et al. disclosure. This rejection is traversed on the basis that the Hagerty et al. disclosure fails to disclose or suggest the specific geometry of the notches recited therein. More specifically, Hagerty et al. do not disclose a corner joint having a locking

means comprising of upset material parts in the shape of a lip projection with a slantingly press-in part of a side member which cooperates with notches defined on the corner piece. Moreover, the notches of Hagerty et al. do not have a triangular shape that is defined by one side against which a lip projection is positioned being longer than another side over which a free end of the lip projection is pressed in.

There do not appear to be any lip projections and corresponding notches recited in the Hagerty et al. disclosure, as recited in claim 31 of the present application. Instead Hagerty et al. merely discloses notches 25 and fastening tongues 32 which engage such notches.

While the notches of claim 31 of the present application have a relationship between one side against which the lip projections are situated and another side over which a free end of the lip projection is pressed in is variable by the compression characteristics of the material of the side members, the notches 25 of the Hagerty et al. disclosure are defined by inwardly converging walls 26 and 27 (FIG. 1; col. 2, 23-39). Each of the notches of Hagerty et al. have a V-shaped cross-section but lack the characteristics of the notches recited in claim 31 relative to lip projections.

In view of these observations, Applicant respectfully submits that the Hagerty et al. disclosure does not disclose or suggest the corner joint recited in claim 31 of the present application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Claims 32, 33, 41, 44 and 47 Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as Being Anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,797,194 (Ekstein)

Claims 32, 33, 41, 44 and 47 presently stand rejected as being anticipated by the Ekstein disclosure. It will be pointed out that claim 32 has been amended to be dependent from claim 31, and claims 33 and 41 depend from claim 32. Applicant submits that the Ekstein disclosure does not recite the geometry of the notches and

their relationship with corresponding features of the corner joint recited in claim 31. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 32, 33 and 41 is respectfully requested.

Claims 44 and 47 have been amended to be dependent from claim 29 which was acknowledged in the Office Action as being allowed. Thus, these claims are presently in patentable form, and withdrawal of this rejection is thus requested.

5. Rejection of Claim 35 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over DE 43 05 377 (Hustadt et al.) In View of U.S. Patent 4,651,482 (Borys)

As indicated above, claim 35 has been amended to depend from claim 29. Accordingly, claim 35 is dependent upon an allowable claim, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

6. Rejection of Claim 49 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over DE 43 05 377 (Hustadt et al.) In View of U.S. Patent 4,530,195 (Leopold)

As indicated above, claim 49 has been amended to depend from claim 29. Accordingly, claim 49 is dependent upon an allowable claim, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

7. Conclusion

In view of the amendments to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the pending claims be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

Application No.: 09/806,304
Examiner: Ryan FLANDRO
Art Unit: 3679

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's Attorney, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500

Date: June 23, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205